

# EXHIBIT 14

1                   IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
2                   FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA  
3                   Richmond Division

4  
5   ePlus, Inc.,

6                                   Plaintiff,

7   versus

309 CV 620

8   Lawson Software, Inc.

9                                   Defendant

10  
11  
12  
13               before: HONORABLE ROBERT E. PAYNE  
14               Senior United States District Judge

15  
16                               August 10, 2010  
17                               Richmond, Virginia

18  
19                               Phone Conference

20  
21  
22                               Gilbert F. Halasz, RMR  
23                               Official Court Reporter  
24                               U. S. Courthouse  
25                               Richmond, Virginia  
                             (804) 916-2248

1           cetera. I haven't heard word one, so I am  
2           deciding you decided to ride the horses you  
3           have got.

4           MR. McDONALD: No, we are planning on  
5           using additional experts. We have been in  
6           negotiations with ePlus on an agreed time table  
7           for the service of the report and the  
8           depositions to get them all done before the  
9           trial. I think we are going to be successful  
10          with that.

11          THE COURT: Okay.

12          MR. ROBERTSON: This is Mr. Robertson. We  
13          didn't agree on a time table, Dan, let's be  
14          fair. We had a discussion about it yesterday.

15          THE COURT: Wait a minute, Mr. Robertson.  
16          He said, we were working with you. He didn't  
17          say -- and he said, I think we will be  
18          successful. You are saying you don't think you  
19          will be. That is a different animal. But he  
20          didn't say you reached an agreement.

21          MR. ROBERTSON: You are accurate, Your  
22          Honor. Absolutely.

23          Obviously we would like to know who the  
24          additional experts are as soon as possible. We  
25          would like to get a disclosure from and take

1           their deposition in a meaningful way before  
2           trial. The proposal has been made that they  
3           would give us, identify their validity expert  
4           by tomorrow. They don't know when they would  
5           identify the source code expert they are  
6           aspiring to get and giving us a report. We go  
7           from August 25 and produce the witnesses for  
8           deposition August -- the week of August 30.

9           THE COURT: Does that suit you?

10          MR. McDONALD: That would suit me if we  
11          could get that time. I might have,  
12          obviously -- two concerns I have. I mean, it  
13          is their burden on invalidity. I would like to  
14          be able to, obviously, respond to that. So  
15          that actually puts me in a tighter bind.  
16          Secondly, I assume the spirit and letter of The  
17          Court's scheduling order on the two disciplines  
18          that what was not contemplated is that they get  
19          to call another expert to get up and say, I  
20          agree with Dr. Shamos.

21          THE COURT: No, no. They can't do that.

22          MR. McDONALD: Secondly, I would think  
23          your ruling on that, they are confined to the  
24          second supplemental statement, means they still  
25          can't go outside of that with respect to